

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	Rosemary Holmes	03/06/2021 10:15:59	PETITNOBJ E	<p>This is a most iconic and beautiful part of London, a huge tourist attraction and an oasis of calm for residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>Already this area is disrupted by HS2 works.</p> <p>To put a telephone mast and its paraphernalia here is disruptive, destructive and too awful to contemplate.</p> <p>We object in the strongest terms.</p>
2021/1813/P	Juliet Wrightson	03/06/2021 11:55:37	OBJ	<p>I could not imagine how anyone could envisage placing such an installation on this site. I wonder if Mr. Chris Weir did the entire exercise from his desk in Edinburgh. ¿Swiss Cottage¿ appears as the third line of the site address? The council have known about this since 9 June 2020 and one councillor firmly objected to it. (PP 09736661) No information is given of the ¿officer¿s name¿ ¿who gave assistance or prior advice¿. As far as I can see the only change was an insignificant one of height of the mast. Not much has been made of the ¿built in cabinet¿ and ¿Three separate cabinets¿ that are also part of this application. It is not just a tall mast as shown by blue line on photos though this would be bad enough.</p> <p>Of the discounted options there is one area significantly absent which is equidistant from the target spot as the one proposed namely the far end of Fitzroy road/Gloucester Avenue.</p> <p>It seems that this consultation is taking place a year after the Council knew about it in the midst of the half term holiday period with work expected to start in July 2021. This is not the best practice and the Council should think again.</p> <p>I object strongly to this application.</p>
2021/1813/P	Lucy Cottrell	03/06/2021 22:10:24	OBJ	<p>The suggestion that a mast should be located here was so strange that at first I thought it was a joke. Clearly in such a prominent position, in a conservation area, it will have a major visual impact, and not a positive one. I object.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/1813/P	Charles and Caroline Medawar	03/06/2021 15:48:15	COMMNT	<p>I have carefully read this planning application, including the many comments from local residents – all of them opposing the application, with several expressing the view that installation of this 5G mast amounts to “vandalism”. I believe the proposal to be something worse than that. Leaving aesthetic questions aside, my main concerns relate to [a] quality of the planning application; [b] adequacy of planning scrutiny; and [c] integrity of Primrose Hill as a Conservation Area</p> <p>[a] It doesn’t help that this planning application (2021/1813/P) is written in the style of an Estate Agent’s blurb. The Applicants seem to have gone through the motions, but not much more. The contrast between the blustering over-confidence of the application and the perceptions of the community that may have to live with this monstrous mast, is truly embarrassing. It seems from the application that Hutchison 3G (UK) Ltd, and its agents, are completely insensitive to legitimate aesthetic concerns. Either that, and/or the applicants are confident that no serious objection to the proposal can be sustained. The verbiage seems to speak for itself: “particular care has been taken to ensure the location will have a minimal visual impact upon the many residential properties within the surrounding area, which the apparatus will ultimately serve... “</p> <p>“the application site has been specifically selected to minimise visual impact upon the immediate and wider area “</p> <p>“The proposed scheme has been designed to ensure the fundamental principles of good siting and appearance are adhered to. The overall impact of the installation on the environment is therefore considered limited”</p> <p>“the proposed design has been selected to minimise visual impact upon the streetscape by integrating with the existing built environment.“</p> <p>The Applicants admit that “To operate efficiently, the radio antennas must be clear of obstructions such as buildings and trees” ... but then claim, implausibly, that “the equipment will benefit from screening in respect of the adjacent trees.”</p> <p>It seems a major deficiency of the application that there is no thorough explanation of the choice of this site. Reference is made, with some brief explanation, to the lack of suitability of a number of side streets, but the reason for selecting the chosen site is simply that it is seen as “as being the most suitable for H3G’s business development, meeting its specific technical and operational requirements.“ It is far from clear that the applicants exhausted the search for other, more appropriate sites.</p> <p>[b] Adequacy of planning scrutiny</p> <p>The Application details many areas in which the powers of the planning authorities are circumscribed. Moreover, the applicants suggest that the benefits of enhanced communications so far outweigh environmental and social considerations, that the planning authorities might approve the application pretty much on their nod: “The overall impact of the installation on the environment is therefore considered limited when viewed in the context that high-speed mobile connectivity is the lifeblood of a Community.“</p> <p>In these circumstances, it would seem that the challenge to Camden planning authorities is not simply to approve the application, or not, but to fully explain and justify any decision to approve the application, notably by declaring itself satisfied that there existed no satisfactory alternative.</p> <p>[c] Integrity of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area</p> <p>This proposal envisages the erection of a 5G mast three times the height of the adjacent lamppost and six metres taller than the closest tree. The illustration at Fig 5 of the Proposed Elevation drawings shows the design mast to be wholly out of character with the immediate environment, and an obvious eyesore. It seems impossible to reconcile this proposed development with Camden Council’s Statement on the Primrose Hill Conservation Area</p> <p>The PHCA makes meticulous and detailed planning requirements on even minuscule developments – e.g. the height and shape of the crowns of individual trees in the Area, and the siting of TV aerials and dishes:</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

"Dishes are not normally acceptable where they are positioned on the main facade of a building or in a prominent position easily seen from the street. The smallest practical size should be chosen with the dish kept to the rear of the property, below the ridge line and out of sight if at roof level. Planning permission may be required."

If this application were to be approved, I believe it would make a laughing stock of planning law. This monstrous mast would not only degrade the environment and disgrace the community. I believe it would also thoroughly diminish the whole notion and ethos of a Conservation Area.

Primrose Hill and Regent's Park reinforce the green character of the Conservation Area. Large sections of Albert Terrace, Prince Albert Road and Regent's Park Road run direct alongside the parks, affording views across the parkland and of mature trees that line the edges of these open spaces.
